

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 31, 40, and 45 are currently being amended.

Claims 51-57 are being added.

Claim 48 has been rewritten in independent format but is otherwise the same, including having the same scope.

After amending the claims as set forth above, Claims 31-57 are now pending in this application, of which Claims 31, 40, 45, and 48 are independent.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

On page 2 of the Office Action, Claims 45 and 47 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as anticipated by Nookala (US Pat. No. 5,860,016). Claim 45 (as amended) recites “selecting a first display mode or a second display mode based on a characteristic of an application running on the processor.” Nookala does not disclose selecting a first display mode or a second display mode based on a characteristic of an application running on the processor. Rather, Nookala discloses selecting a low power mode based on inactivity of the device. See, Nookala at 5:3-18.

Since Nookala does not disclose at least one element of Claim 45 (as amended), Nookala does not anticipate Claim 45. Claim 47 depends from Claim 45 and is not anticipated for at least the same reasons as Claim 45.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

A. Claims 31-32, 35-37, 40-44, 46, and 49 over Nookala

On page 3 of the Office Action, Claims 31-32, 35-37, 40-44, 46, and 49 were rejected as unpatentable under 35 USC § 103(a) over Nookala (US Pat. No. 5,860,016).

1. Claims 31-32, 35-37

Claim 31 (as amended) recites “wherein both the first display mode and the second display mode may be changed to by the display logic while the device is being actively used by a user.” Nookala does not teach or suggest that the first display mode and the second display mode may be changed to by the display logic while the device is being actively used by a user. Rather, as discussed above, Nookala discloses selecting a low power mode based on inactivity of the device. See, Nookala at 5:3-18. Moreover, nothing in Nookala suggests this element which is not disclosed in Nookala. In fact, the entire point of Nookala is to switch to the low power mode during periods of inactivity.

Since Nookala fails to teach or suggest at least one element of Claim 31 (as amended), withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 31 is respectfully requested. Claims 32 and 35-37 depend from Claim 31 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 31.

2. Claims 40-44

Claim 40 (as amended) recites that “the controller is configured to display an image associated with an application in the second display mode using a same size amount of a display as when displaying an image in the first display mode.” Nookala does not disclose a controller that is configured to display an image associated with an application in the second display mode using a same size amount of a display as when displaying an image in the first display mode. Rather, Nookala discloses that during the normal mode that 420 lines of the display are used, while the snooze mode only uses up to 32 lines of the display. See Nookala at 3:41-45.

Moreover, nothing in Nookala suggests this element which is not disclosed in Nookala. In fact, using of fewer lines the display is fundamental to Nookala's method of saving power.

Since Nookala fails to teach or suggest at least one element of Claim 40 (as amended), withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 40 is respectfully requested. Claims 41-44 depend from Claim 40 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 40.

3. Claims 46 and 49

As discussed above (see Rejections 35 USC § 102), Claim 45 (as amended) recites and Nookala fails to disclose "selecting a first display mode or a second display mode based on a characteristic of an application running on the processor." Rather, Nookala discloses selecting the low power display mode based on inactivity of the device. Moreover, nothing in Nookala suggests this element not disclosed in Nookala. In fact, the primary purpose of Nookala's low power mode is to replace the Standby mode as the default mode entered by the display in response to inactivity.

Since Nookala fails to teach or suggest at least one element of Claim 45 (as amended), and since Claims 46 and 49 depend from Claim 45, withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 46 and 49 is respectfully requested.

B. Claims 33, 38-39, 48, and 50 over Nookala in view of O'Leary

On page 7 of the Office Action, claims 33, 38, 39, 48, and 50 were under 35 USC § 103(a) over Nookala (US Pat. No. 5,860,016) as discussed above (see section A) in view of O'Leary (U.S. Pat. No. 6,750,850).

1. Claims 33, 38, and 39

Claims 33, 38, and 39 depend from Claim 31. As a result, Claims 33, 38, and 39 include all of the elements of Claim 31. Claim 31 (as amended) recites “wherein both the first display mode and the second display mode may be changed to by the display logic while the device is being actively used by a user.” As discussed above, Nookala does not teach or suggest this element. Further, O’Leary also fails to teach or suggest this element. Rather, O’Leary only appears to disclose a single display mode. Moreover, nothing in the combination of Nookala and O’Leary suggests this element which is not taught or suggested by either reference individually.

Since Claims 33, 38, and 39 include at least one element not taught or suggested by the combination of Nookala and O’Leary, withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 33, 38, and 39 is respectfully requested.

2. Claim 48

Claim 48 has been rewritten in independent form and recites “wherein in the second mode only textual types of graphical information are displayed.” As recognized by the Office Action on page 7 of the office action that Nookala fails to disclose this element. The Office Action states that this element is disclosed in O’Leary citing col. 3, lines 32-57. This element is not disclosed in O’Leary. As apparently recognized by the Office Action, O’Leary instead discloses that both textual types of graphical information and graphics icons types of graphical information are displayed. See O’Leary at col. 3, lines 37-39. Additionally, nothing in the combination of Nookala and O’Leary teaches or suggests this element which is not disclosed by either reference individually.

Since Claim 48 includes at least one element not taught or suggested by the combination of Nookala and O’Leary, withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 48 is respectfully requested.

3. Claim 50

Claim 50 depends from Claim 45. As a result, Claim 50 includes all of the elements of Claim 45. Claim 45 (as amended) recites “selecting a first display mode or a second display mode based on a characteristic of an application running on the processor.” As discussed above, Nookala does not teach or suggest this element. Further, O’Leary also fails to teach or suggest this element. Rather, O’Leary only appears to disclose a single display mode. Moreover, nothing in the combination of Nookala and O’Leary suggests this element which is not taught or suggested by either reference individually.

Since Claim 50 includes at least one element not taught or suggested by the combination of Nookala and O’Leary, withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 50 is respectfully requested.

C. Claim 34 over Nookala in view of Fujimoto

On page 9 of the office action, Claim 34 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) over Nookala (US Pat. No. 5,860,016) in view of Fujimoto (US Pat. No. 5,500,654).

Claim 34 depends from Claim 31. As a result, Claim 34 includes all of the elements of Claim 31. Claim 31 (as amended) recites “wherein both the first display mode and the second display mode may be changed to by the display logic while the device is being actively used by a user.” As discussed above, Nookala fails to teach or suggest this element. Fujimoto likewise fails to disclose this element. Rather, Fujimoto discloses that images are always displayed in high resolution. See, e.g. Fig. 2. Fujimoto discloses that a lower resolution image is displayed in a smaller region of the high resolution display while the remainder of the high resolution display is set to a background color. See, e.g. Fujimoto at col. 8, lines 28-35.

Additionally, nothing in the combination of Nookala and Fujimoto teaches or suggests this element which is not disclosed by either reference individually.

Amendments and Added Claims

Claims 31, 40, and 45 are amended. The amendments to the claims are supported by the specification as filed and do not add new matter. See, e.g. paragraphs 20 and 22.

Claims 51-57 have been added. Claims 51-57 are supported by the specification as filed. See, e.g., paragraphs 18, 20, and 21. Claims 51-57 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by the credit card payment instructions in EFS-Web being incorrect or absent, resulting in a rejected or incorrect credit card transaction, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to

Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date /June 23, 2008/

By /Marcus A. Burch/

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 26371
Telephone: (414) 297-5571
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Marcus A. Burch
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 52,673